UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,553	10/18/2000	Michael G. Coutts	8573.00	3877

26889   7590   09/02/2008
MICHAEL CHAN
NCR CORPORATION
1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD
DAYTON, OH 45479-0001

EXAMINER
PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/691,553	COUTTS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HARESH N. PATEL	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 June 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *39-47* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *39-47* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 39-47 are subject to examination. Claims 1-38 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments dated 6/16/2008 (i.e., web browser 36 in Figure 2 gains access to

the Internet 16, to thereby reach the server 12, etc.) are persuasive and therefore, the finality of

office action dated 10/19/2007 is withdrawn and the prosecution is hereby reopened. However,

upon further consideration of the available prior arts, the claimed subject matter is rejected with

the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Note: The following rejections are presented considering the applicant's statements dated

6/16/2008, i.e., web browser 36 in Figure 2 gains access to the Internet 16, to thereby reach the

server 12, etc.

4.   Claims 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barcelou et al.,

Transactions Holdings Limited, 6,945,457 (Hereinafter Barcelou).

5.   Referring to claims 39, Barcelou discloses a method of operating a self-service terminal

having a number of peripheral devices and a terminal application which controls the peripheral

devices (e.g., usage of well-known Automated teller machine with internet support including

web browser application, col., 3, lines 2 – 48), the method comprising the steps of:

presenting to a self-service terminal user an option of accessing a remote third party

application to obtain a service from the third party application while the user is at the self-service

terminal (e.g., internet information access application, col., 3, lines 2 – 48); receiving a request

from the third party application to use one of the peripheral devices of the self-service terminal in

response to the user accessing the third party application to obtain the service from the third

party application (e.g., access application support user request, col., 4, lines 8 – 51); using the

terminal application to determine if the request received from the third party application should

be granted (e.g., whether user request be granted or not, col., 4, lines 8 - 51); and if so activating

the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral

device is not passed to the third party application when the request from the third party

application to use the peripheral device is granted, and thereby to allow the user to obtain the

service via the peripheral device (e.g., user accessing internet service using the ATM device,

col., 4, lines 8 - 51).

6.   Referring to claim 40, Barcelou discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barcelou also discloses monitoring terminal usage during operation of the third party application

to ensure that the user is still present (e.g., col., 4, lines 8 - 51).

7.   Referring to claim 41, Barcelou discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barcelou also discloses sending a response to the third party application to indicate the status of

the request received from the third party application (e.g., col., 5, lines 11 - 51).

8.   Referring to claim 42, Barcelou discloses a self-service terminal comprising: a peripheral

device; a terminal application which controls the peripheral devices; and a controller (e.g., col.,

3, lines 2 – 48), for (i) receiving a request from a remote third party application to use the

peripheral device in response to the user accessing the third party application to obtain a service

from the third party application while the user is at the self-service terminal (e.g., col., 3, lines 2

– 48), (ii) using the terminal application to determine if the request received from the third party

application should be granted (e.g., col., 4, lines 8 - 51); and (iii) activating the selected

peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral

device is not passed to the third party application at any time (e.g., col., 4, lines 8 - 51).

9.   Referring to claim 43, Barcelou discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barcelou also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a user input device (e.g., col., 3,

lines 2 – 48).

10.   Referring to claim 44, Barcelou discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barcelou also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 3,

lines 2 – 48).

11.   Referring to claim 45, Barcelou discloses a self-service terminal comprising: a cash

dispenser for dispensing cash to a self-service terminal user conducting a self-service cash

dispensing transaction (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48); a peripheral device for presenting information

to the user; a memory storing a terminal application which controls the peripheral device; and a

processor (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48) for (i) receiving a request from a remote third party

application which is different from the terminal application to use the peripheral device to

present third party information to the user (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48), (ii) determining if the

request from the third party application should be fulfilled (e.g., col., 4, lines 8 - 51) and (iii) if

so, using the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the

peripheral device is not passed to the third party application at any time to present the user with

the third party information and thereby to fulfill the request (e.g., col., 4, lines 8 - 51).

12.   Referring to claim 46, Barcelou discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barcelou also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 3,

lines 2 – 48).

13.   Referring to claim 47, Barcelou discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barcelou also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 3,

lines 2 – 48).

14.   Claims 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Drummond et

al., 6,598,023 (Hereinafter Drummond-Diebold).

15.   Referring to claims 39, Dummond discloses a method of operating a self-service terminal

having a number of peripheral devices and a terminal application which controls the peripheral

devices (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14) the method comprising

the steps of:

        presenting to a self-service terminal user an option of accessing a remote third party

application to obtain a service from the third party application while the user is at the self-service

terminal (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14); receiving a request

from the third party application to use one of the peripheral devices of the self-service terminal in

response to the user accessing the third party application to obtain the service from the third

party application (e.g., col., 7, lines 8 – col., 64); using the terminal application to determine if

the request received from the third party application should be granted (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 –

col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14); and if so activating the peripheral device under control

of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third

party application when the request from the third party application to use the peripheral device is

granted, and thereby to allow the user to obtain the service via the peripheral device (e.g., col., 14, lines 38 – col., 15, line 46).

16.   Referring to claim 40, Dummond discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dummond also discloses monitoring terminal usage during operation of the third party application to ensure that the user is still present (e.g., col., 14, lines 38 – col., 15, line 46).

17.   Referring to claim 41, Dummond discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Dummond also discloses sending a response to the third party application to indicate the status of the request received from the third party application (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14).

18.   Referring to claim 42, Dummond discloses a self-service terminal comprising: a peripheral device; a terminal application which controls the peripheral devices; and a controller (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14) for (i) receiving a request from a remote third party application to use the peripheral device in response to the user accessing the third party application to obtain a service from the third party application while the user is at the self-service terminal, (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14) (ii) using the terminal application to determine if the request received from the third party application should be granted, (e.g., col., 7, lines 8 – col., 64); and (iii) activating the selected peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third party application at any time (e.g., col., 14, lines 38 – col., 15, line 46).

19.   Referring to claim 43, Dummond discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Dummond also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a user input device (e.g., col., 2,

lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14).

20.   Referring to claim 44, Dummond discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Dummond also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 2,

lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14).

21.   Referring to claim 45, Dummond discloses a self-service terminal comprising: a cash

dispenser for dispensing cash to a self-service terminal user conducting a self-service cash

dispensing transaction (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14); a

peripheral device for presenting information to the user; a memory storing a terminal application

which controls the peripheral device; and a processor (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line

60 – col., 5, line 14) for (i) receiving a request from a remote third party application which is

different from the terminal application to use the peripheral device to present third party

information to the user, (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14)(ii)

determining if the request from the third party application should be fulfilled, (e.g., col., 7, lines

8 – col., 64); and (iii) if so, using the peripheral device under control of the terminal application

such that control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third party application at any time

to present the user with the third party information and thereby to fulfill the request (e.g., col.,

14, lines 38 – col., 15, line 46).

22.   Referring to claim 46, Dummond discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Dummond also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 2,

lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14).

23.   Referring to claim 47, Dummond discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Dummond also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 2,

lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14).

Conclusion

The claims contain "if" conditional statements regarding the limitations. In order to

expedite the prosecution of this case, multiple references are used for the rejections to

demonstrate that several references disclose the claimed subject matter of the claims. Examiner

has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page

numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to

the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well.

It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the

references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the

context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to

8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Haresh N. Patel/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154

August 25, 2008

/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154